DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 053 IR 006 096

TITLE Toward Cooperative Collection Development in the Illinois Library and Information Network.
INSTITUTION Illinois State Library, Springfield.
PUB DATE Jan 77
NOTE 48p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Information Networks; Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; *Library Planning; Library Programs; *Library Services; *Needs Assessment; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS ILLINET; *Illinois Library and Information Network

ABSTRACT

Findings and recommendations are reported by three subcommittees charged with determining the unmet needs of the Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET) and establishing a set of priorities that must be completed before the needs can be met. The report also addresses the responsibilities of cooperating libraries at all levels within the network, the role of the Research and Reference Centers, and the obligations of the state in supporting full library service to all users. Reports of each subcommittee are given in separate sections--Resource Identification, Access, and Responsibilities at All Levels, followed by the enumeration and discussion of specific recommendations. Major recommendations include: (1) all participating libraries in ILLINET should adopt and foster "user oriented acquisitions" as their collection development philosophy; (2) the state library should sponsor a statewide in-depth survey to determine unmet needs, examine subject strengths and from these examinations, specify system subject collection responsibilities; (3) ILLINET should study the feasibility of establishing a strategically located storage center (or centers) for little used or last copy materials; and (4) ILLINET should move toward conversion to machine readable form of the bibliographic holdings records of cooperating libraries. Appendices include cost estimates for a directory of libraries and information centers in the Chicago Metropolitan Area, description of the nominal group technique used to determine need priorities; and a report of the Illinois State Library Task Force on Non-Print Materials. (JPF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160053

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TOWARD
COOPERATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT
IN THE
ILLINOIS LIBRARY AND INFORMATION NETWORK

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathryn J. Gesterfield

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A REPORT

SUBMITTED BY

THE COOPERATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

OF THE RESEARCH AND REFERENCE CENTER DIRECTORS

JANUARY 1977

PRELIMINARY UNAPPROVED REPORT

IR006096

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	1
Introduction	4
Report of the Responsibilities Subcommittee	5
Report of the Resources Identification Subcommittee	15
Report of the Access Subcommittee	18
Summary and Recommendations	24
Appendices	
A. Charge to the Subcommittee	35
B. Libraries and Information Centers in the Chicago Metropolitan Area - Cost Estimates	36
C. Nominal Group Technique	38
D. Report of the Illinois State Library Task Force on Non-Print Materials	43

PREFACE

The Cooperative Collection Development Subcommittee of the Research and Reference Center Directors grew out of a series of three policy meetings held during 1975. The first, held on January 10, 1975 was attended by representatives from the Illinois library systems; the second, held on February 21, 1975 was attended by representatives from Research and Reference Centers; and the third, held on August 28, 1975 was attended by representatives from systems, R & R centers, special, and academic libraries. This last meeting resulted in the recommendation that a subcommittee on cooperative collection development be appointed and charged to identify the unmet needs of ILLINET (Illinois Library and Information Network) and to make recommendations to identify or develop collections which can meet those needs.

Members of the Subcommittee were appointed in late 1975 and held their first meeting in Springfield on January 27, 1976. Patrick M. O'Brien, Assistant Chief Librarian for the Central Library of the Chicago Public Library was elected chairman. Other members of the Subcommittee were Elaine Albright, Coordinator of Illinois Research & Reference Activities, University of Illinois, Champaign/Urbana; Betty Albsmeyer, Reference Librarian, Free Public Library-Quincy; Nancy Clausen, Manager, Information Services, Borg Warner Corporation; William DeJohn, Senior Consultant, Library Cooperation, Illinois State Library; Robert Drescher, Network Development Consultant, Suburban Library System; Joseph Gregg, Acquisitions Librarian, Northeastern Illinois University; Margaret Herman, Acting Head of Technical Services, Illinois State Library; Marilyn (Humphreville) Borea, Head, Interlibrary Loan Center, Chicago Public Library; Paul Johnson, Interlibrary Loan Librarian, Rolling Prairie Libraries; Adrian Jones, Director of Libraries, Roosevelt University; Elliott Kanner, Resources Coordinator, North Suburban Library System; Thomas

Kilpatrick, Interlibrary Loan Librarian, Southern Illinois University/ Carbondale; Nancy Klinka, School Librarian, Maine Township North High School, DesPlaines, Illinois; Bridget L. Lamont, Consultant, Illinois State Library; Candy Morgan, Reference Coordinator, Illinois State Library; Colleen Richards, Information Services Consultant, Lewis & Clark Library System; Ann M. Seidman, Technical Librarian, A.E. Staley Manufacturing Company; Lou Snelson, School Librarian, Niantic Harristown High School; Margaret Wainer, Director, Carl Sandburg Community College Library; June Weitting, Director, Wheaton College Library. Two persons were added to the subcommittee in August: Dennis Huslig, Non Print Media Consultant, Illinois Valley Library System and George N. Voegel, Dean of Learning Resources, William Rainey Harper College. Harold Rath, former Librarian at Southern Illinois University/Carbondale, served as a consultant to the subcommittee.

The charge to the subcommittee was to "identify the unmet needs of citizens who use the Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET) for resources and information" (See Appendix A, p.34). Several objectives were included along with the above charge. The charge was somewhat narrower than many of the objectives and the subcommittee determined that Objective 4, "to suggest possible areas of cooperation and coordination among the components of ILLINET in collection development to meet needs of citizens who utilize ILLINET" was the most important and all-encompassing. It was this objective that became the operating charge of the subcommittee.

At the initial meeting of the subcommittee, a modification of the Nominal Group Technique (see Appendix C, pp.38-42) was used. Some one hundred priorities were identified and loosely classed under definitions; resource identification; responsibility at all levels; realistic parameters; planning/

implementation; access; budgets/funding; legal ramifications; and evaluation.

At the next meeting the subcommittee began the process of eliminating duplication of priorities. With this accomplished three major areas of concern emerged and subcommittees were set up to address them. These were the Subcommittee on Resource Identification; the Subcommittee on Responsibilities at All Levels; and the Subcommittee on Access. A fourth subcommittee, Planning and Implementation, was also established to monitor the progress of the other subcommittees; pull together recommendations; and prepare the report of the CCD Subcommittee for presentation to the Research and Reference Center Directors.

At its April meeting the subcommittee approved a plan for a report on a cooperative collection development program for the state based on priorities developed by the special subcommittees. The March, April, May, August, October, December, and January 1977 meetings resulted in the production of chapter drafts, revisions and action recommendations all of which contributed to the following report.

The report of the Illinois State Library Task Force on Access to Non-Print Materials has been assigned to this subcommittee for review and implementation. The subcommittee plans to integrate it into its subsequent report and determine various follow-up steps. (See Appendix D)

INTRODUCTION

The State of Illinois is one of the most progressive states in the country in terms of library system development. The Illinois Library and Information Network, or ILLINET, with more than a ten year operational history at this writing, is comprised of 18 library systems encompassing 98.4% of all Illinois public libraries with 85.9% of the academic libraries, 50% of the special libraries, and 25% of the school libraries within the state as affiliate members. Included in those libraries are four Research and Reference Centers and three Special Resource Centers. The Subcommittee agrees with the concept of multitype systems and encourages a change in the legislation to provide all types of libraries a full membership level in the network through the library systems.

Teletype communications, delivery services, OCLC processing, automated circulation, interlibrary loan experiments, and processing centers have been realities in Illinois for some time. Yet, with all of these systems and the resources available in the state, there have never been adequate evaluative procedures in ILLINET for determining just what the unmet information needs of its citizens are and what might be done to meet those needs.

The following report, entitled Toward Cooperative Collection Development in ILLINET, addresses itself not only to the problem of the unmet needs but also attempts to establish a set of priorities that must be completed before those needs can be met. The report also deals with the area of redefining, or defining for the first time, the responsibilities of cooperating libraries at all levels within the network, the role of the Research and Reference Centers, and the obligations of the state in supporting full library service to all.

REPORT OF THE RESPONSIBILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

A. STATE OF THE ART

There is no overall coordinated collection development policy for the Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET) at the present time. Responsibility for the development of resources is reflected by resource development guidelines or standards, resource development policies, and interlibrary loan codes of local libraries and library systems. (The term "local library' applies to any library - academic, public, school, or special - in its function of serving its primary clientele.)

Qualitative and/or quantitative resource development guidelines or standards exist for each type of local library in ILLINET. There seem to be three types of guidelines currently in use: (1) guidelines adopted by a national organization or a unit of a national organization developed for a specific type of library; (2) guidelines modified or completely redrafted for an individual state(s) or for regional use by special libraries; or (3) the guidelines listed above but modified by a local library depending on the needs of the local clientele as perceived by the staff, administration or governing board. No resource development guidelines or standards have been established for library systems. Resource development guidelines do not seem to be a valuable measurement tool in determining the state of ILLINET resource development due to the great differences in application of these guidelines or standards.

Each local participating ILLINET library and each library system has a resource development policy.[1] This policy is generally one of the following types or a combination of two or more of these types: (1) an officially adopted policy by the appropriate administration or governing board; (2) an unwritten, but generally

1. These may include acquisition policies and/or collection development statements.

"understood" policy, not officially adopted but adhered to as if it were official; and (3) no written or "understood" policy. Resource decisions are made by the individual purchasing the resources following this "unspoken" development policy. It is difficult to ascertain the actual state of resource development for participating libraries in ILLINET by reviewing written policy statements. An initial indication leads one to believe that the majority of participating libraries do not have written policies. To document the actual state of resource development in Illinois, it would be necessary to conduct an extensive survey of actual written and unwritten policies, procedures and practices, and also evaluate the extent to which these are implemented. For the purposes of this subcommittee such a survey was not necessary.

If approved resource development guidelines or standards and resource development policies are somewhat limited in helping to determine the present state of responsibilities for resource development within ILLINET, the interlibrary loan codes which exist nationally, regionally, state-wide, and locally may be of more use. Interlibrary loan codes do, at least (depending on the degree to which they are enforced and adhered to by participating libraries), give an implied picture of responsibilities. An examination of existing interlibrary loan policies and procedures provides the best means of determining what the local library and/or library system perceives as its responsibility for the provision of certain kinds of resources.

The Illinois Interlibrary Loan Code, adopted by the Research and Reference (R & R) Centers and the Illinois library systems on May 1, 1971, governs all interlibrary loan transactions sent to the R & R Centers by library systems and academic and special libraries authorized for direct access. Some library systems have developed modified interlibrary loan codes based on the Illinois Interlibrary Loan Code which governs interlibrary loan activities within that system. Others, while having

no written system code, have written procedures which govern system interlibrary loan activities. Interlibrary loan agreements have been developed among some systems, however, these have not been formalized.

In analyzing the system and state interlibrary loan codes, responsibilities were implied in several ways. The most obvious implication is that if an interlibrary loan code excludes a certain class or type of material from being requested, then, providing this material to primary clientele is the responsibility of the local library. Conversely, materials not excluded by an interlibrary loan code may be supplied by other libraries participating in the interlibrary loan arrangement. It is assumed that resources have been developed - although not to the extent they could be - with some thought as to the ability of the library to adequately meet the needs of its primary clientele through interlibrary loan arrangements. It can be assumed that if resources are not needed on a continuing basis to support the resource information needs of primary clientele and if they are available through interlibrary lending, then these resources will not be developed at the local level. Also, it can be assumed that if the resources are needed on a regular basis whether they are excluded from being requested through interlibrary loan or not, the local library will develop these resources accordingly. If materials are not needed on a regular basis at the local library and are excluded from interlibrary lending, then the local library will have to determine whether to supply these items by developing resources of their own or simply not provide them.

B. PROPOSED LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY

The survival and growth of library service depend upon the ability to provide needed resources and information readily. It is no longer possible for any library/information center to provide information and resources to meet all of the potential demands of its clientele. Obviously, having everything on everything is the optimum, but impossible, situation. The best approach for libraries today is to provide those

items which are most frequently in demand by their primary clientele and to provide access to other resources and information which cannot be provided on site. For Illinois libraries such access can be provided through participation in ILLINET.

Participating libraries must recognize the existence of ILLINET in developing their resource collections and realize that access to ILLINET is a basic part of library and information service. Patrons, librarians and members of boards of governance must recognize that network service is an integral part of local service to users. Through participation in ILLINET the days of forced independence of libraries in providing their clientele with all the information and resources requested are over.

Local Level

Each ILLINET participant must assume responsibility for meeting the general needs of its primary clientele. At the local library level, traditional "selective" resource development will be changed to user-oriented development of resources. Resource development at the local level must be designed to respond to what the users need to meet their recurring educational, recreational, and intellectual needs.

It does not mean that anything requested by a user will automatically be acquired. It does mean that when requests are made for materials at the local level, the local library will make a judgement as to whether this is something that can and should be added to the library's collection. Standards of quality or literary merit should not be imposed. The simple fact that the user desires the material should be sufficient for the material to be considered for purchase.

Resources should be developed at the local library level only if there is demonstrable local demand. Each local library will have a "core collection" reflecting the needs

of its particular clientele. The concept of standardized "basic library collections" as popularized by various professional library associations and booksellers will be eliminated as a method for measurement and development of library resources. Collections of materials will be flexible according to need.

A balanced collection reflecting all points of view on any given issue must be made available to individuals who need or want such information. All of this information does not necessarily need to be provided at the local library level. A major impetus must be made to make the public aware of ILLINET's ability to provide this information at other than the local level. It must be realized that ILLINET can no longer be considered a supplemental service. All citizens of Illinois must know that they have a <u>right</u> to expect to have their informational needs met at the local level either through on site materials or through ready access to the needed material. It is not a privilege to have this material requested, it is the right of the individual. It is only with this fundamental guarantee of the provision of resources that cooperative collection development utilizing existing and potential resources in the state can be truly effective.

Since each local library assumes the responsibility for local demand, specific responsibility for cooperative collection development can, realistically, only be enforced at the system, the R & R Center, and the Special Resource Center levels of ILLINET.

<u>System Level</u>

The system level is where the idea of responsibility for cooperative collection development begins. The library system will be the lowest level to which specific responsibility for cooperative collection development can be placed. Each system is responsible for providing: (1) a system collection consisting of resources sup-

plemental to local library collections and developed to meet local demand; (2) bibliographic, on site, and remote access to resources within the system service area; (3) bibliographic access and referral to resources of other collections; and (4) in depth subject collections of a non-research nature for ILLINET which will be made readily available to all ILLINET participants. The obligation for meeting these responsibilities may be retained by the system or shared with its member and affiliate member libraries. It is recommended that each system involve all participants in design of such levels of responsibility.

Participating libraries within each system will determine the nature of the supplemental resources purchased by the system. The major portion of each system collection will be developed in response to demand from local libraries. The other portion of the system collection will consist of materials for which a demand is anticipated.

System resources include all materials purchased with system funds and access to the collections of its participating libraries. This access includes bibliographic, on site, and remote (interlibrary loan) access. When requested information and materials cannot be provided from these resources, the system is responsible for referring appropriate requests to other systems and/or to R & R Centers.

In addition to a system collection, each system should develop and maintain an in depth subject collection of a non-research nature which shall be made available to other libraries within the network. The library system directors and the R & R Center directors will determine what the unmet general needs of the network actually are, and then decide which systems will collect in which subject areas. These collections should be built upon existing strengths or in response to a system demand. Bibliographic access, either manual or automated, to these collections should be made available to other ILLINET members. (Some systems have already begun such col-

lections. These include the geneology collection at Shawnee Library System, and the law enforcement collection at Lewis & Clark Library System.) It is recommended that these collections be financed with special funding. Systems should maintain adequately trained staff to provide interlibrary loan and information services to ILLINET from these in depth subject collections.

The purpose of these in depth subject collections and the system collections is to fill the general demand generated at the local level that the local library cannot fill. Research and Reference Centers cannot be expected to provide resources for the general requests that are now being sent to them by library systems.

Research and Reference Center Level[2]

The four R & R Centers are very different both in the nature of their collections and in the types of primary clientele they serve. The cooperative collection development responsibilities of these centers should reflect these differences. Each R & R Center is a local library when it is serving its primary clientele and its collections reflect the demand of that clientele. The contribution of each R & R Center to ILLINET will be closely related to its function of meeting the needs of its primary clientele.

The University of Illinois/Urbana and Southern Illinois University/Carbondale are academic libraries serving the needs of their students, faculty and staff. Although these are libraries of the same type, their collections differ greatly. The main responsibility of each library is the continued support of academic curriculum and research activity of their institution. In developing resources to support these activities, the University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University libraries will be

---

2. It is recommended that the name Research and Reference Center be changed to Resource and Research Center to more accurately describe the function of these centers. These centers supply resource material in response to interlibrary loan and information requests in addition to their research responsibilities for collection development.

serving ILLINET. The resources of these academic libraries are, by their very nature, research collections. Materials are purchased and retained in the collection to meet current demand as well as to anticipate future demand.

The University of Illinois Library, besides providing access to its collection, will also be responsible for providing verification from foreign bibliographic tools, when necessary, for ILLINET requests.

There is a certain amount of duplication of resources between the libraries of the University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University/Carbondale because of the needs of their users. Obviously, some of this duplication is necessary, however, consideration should be given by these two institutions to the possibility of reducing unnecessary duplication. The appropriate staff from each library should determine when this duplication may be unnecessary and steps should be taken to eliminate it.

The Chicago Public Library serves the general needs of the citizens of Chicago. In serving this local clientele, the Chicago Public Library also serves ILLINET. As a system and as an R & R Center, the Chicago Public Library will be specifically responsible for collecting in six areas: (1) general fiction, both English language and foreign language; (2) general English language non-fiction; (3) resources to meet the needs of Chicago's business and industrial community; (4) expensive sets of general materials; (5) general/popular periodicals, with retrospective holdings; and (6) juvenile materials. Developing resources in these specific areas will answer both local and ILLINET demand.

The Chicago Public Library will purchase resources in sufficient quantity to serve the needs of both the System and ILLINET. Branch collections must be utilized to

achieve this goal. The Chicago Public Library System will be a last copy center for both adult fiction and juvenile materials within ILLINET. Each system will advise the Chicago Public Library System when a last copy of a fiction or juvenile title is being discarded. The Chicago Public Library System will determine if this title should be added to the proposed last copy collection. The entire last copy center collection will be made available to meet ILLINET needs.

Illinois State Law states that the purpose of the Illinois State Library shall be to "(a) maintain a library for State officials and employees of the State, especially of informational material pertaining to the phases of their work and to provide for them material for general reading and study" and to "(h) be a supplementary source through the State - funded library systems for reading materials unavailable in the local libraries."[3] As a "supplementary source" in ILLINET, the Illinois State Library should avoid the duplication of resources of local libraries, library systems, other Research and Reference Centers, and Special Resource Centers except to meet the needs of state officials and employees. However, the Illinois State Library will purchase resources to meet current demands which are not being met by other ILLINET participants.

The Illinois State Library will also assume specific responsibility for the following areas: (1) providing verification from United States bibliographies for ILLINET requests; (2) serving as the primary source for Illinois and United States government documents; and (3) providing materials relating to government and public policy. In developing these resources and services, the Illinois State Library will be serving its primary clientele as well as ILLINET.

It is very important that all ILLINET participants have bibliographic access to R & R Center collections. Without such access, cooperative collection development is unrealistic for ILLINET.

---

3. Illinois Revised Statutes, Chapter 128, Section 107§37.

Special Resource Center Level

The Special Resource Centers are participants of ILLINET because of certain specialized collections already developed by them and needed by ILLINET. It is the responsibility of these libraries to continue to maintain these collections and to make them available, bibliographically ahd physically, to other ILLINET participants.

The creation of any new Special Resource Centers, at this time, seems very remote. All of the major libraries in the state are already members of ILLINET and have agreed to provide their resources to meet network requests. If it becomes apparent that there is a great demand for materials in a subject area apparently not available within ILLINET, the following should take place before merely adding a new special resource center to meet this demand: (1) a survey of existing collections to make certain that such subject materials are not already owned; and (2) consideration should be given to adequately funding an existing R & R Center to develop such a subject collection. No new special resource center should duplicate existing ILLINET resources.

Evaluation

Effective procedures must be established to review and evaluate the library systems, the Research and Reference Centers, and the Special Resource Centers in the ILLINET program of cooperative collection development.

Requirements for Effective Cooperative Collection Development

There are requirements which must be met for the effective implementation of the recommendations in this report. They are outlined below:

(1) The present hierarchical protocol for accessing ILLINET must be changed. While there is a management structural hierarchy, requests

should be routed horizontally as well as vertically, when appropriate. Systems should rely on other systems, as well as on the R & R Centers and Special Resource Centers to meet user needs.

(2) A successful state wide delivery system must be implemented. This delivery system must be fast and economical.

(3) Each local library will have access to the Illinois Data Base (as defined by the Automation Committee of the Illinois State Library) and to the hierarchy of the data bases that will exist within and outside Illinois. The makeup of the Illinois Data Base will have tremendous impact on cooperative collection development.

(4) All librarians, library staff, members of board of governance, and administrators must be trained for the optimum utilization of ILLINET as an integral part of local library service. The Illinois State Library Advisory Committee on Education and Training in their Proposed Statement of Policy on Continuing Education (6th draft) states that the program of this committee is "to provide well trained personnel in sufficient numbers to meet the service needs of libraries, library systems, and the Illinois State Library...." This committee should be responsible for the effective training of all ILLINET personnel in the effective use of the network.

(5) The public must be educated as to the role of ILLINET in library service for their community. The ILLINET Public Information Program should be modified, as necessary, to aid in the process.

(6) Law must be changed to modify the rules and regulations under which

the Illinois State Library administers the Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET).

REPORT OF THE RESOURCES IDENTIFICATION SUBCOMMITTEE

The responsibility for a comprehensive resource identification program is most appropriately assigned to ILLINET: the established network of library systems, Research and Reference Centers, and Special Resource Centers. Any statewide resource program should include as many libraries as possible. ILLINET, which encompasses 98.4% of all Illinois public libraries, 85.9% of the academic libraries, approximately 50% of the special libraries, and about 25% of the school libraries in the state, is the most effective instrument for initiating and maintaining this program objective. Each library system will be responsible for full resource identification of all types of library and information collections within its boundaries. Full resources coverage must include the holdings of libraries not affiliated as well as those affiliated with ILLINET through the library systems. "Resources", for purposes of this report, includes all print and non print materials, i.e., books, journals, and other texts; audio-visual materials; smaller units of information; or data that can be separately manipulated, as by a computer.[1] Resource identification should be compiled, updated and distributed by library systems on a regular basis.

A realistic resource identification program should include the following objectives:

A. To collect and make available (in a machine readable format) all bibliographic data base services, both manual and automated, within Illinois.

---

1. National Commission on Libraries and Information Service, Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals and Action, 1975, pg. 1.

B. To cooperate as a network with other bibliographic data base services outside Illinois (e.g., Ohio College Library Center (OCLC), BALLOTS (Bibliographic Automation of Large Library Operations Using A Time-Sharing System) Midwest Health Science Library Network (MHSLN), etc. . In addition, tie-ins with other state, regional, and national resource identification programs should be explored.

C. To produce a statewide resource directory of ILLINET libraries based on the Illinois Regional Library Council model. Regional system workshops should be held to provide background and guidelines for consistent entry of resources identification data (see Appendix for examples).

D. To establish a statewide machine readable data base to all ILLINET and other cooperating institutions. This should include recommendations of the Illinois State Library Automation Committee. Access to the data base should be guaranteed to all cooperating libraries. Retrospective as well as current records for this data base should be made available wherever possible.

E. To include other Illinois information resources as part of the overall resource identification program (e.g., museum realia; resource people; census data; archives; material in non-traditional collections) after primary resources are identified.

F. To examine present acquisitions policies of ILLINET library members and cooperating institutions for identification of any current resource strengths. To facilitate this identification procedure, it is expected that each library should have a written acquisition policy.

G. To utilize the findings of similar Illinois resource identification programs, either in process or completed, so as to avoid duplication (e.g., Downs study[2], LICCMA directory[3], IITRI study[4], Special Report to Coopera-

---

2. Downs, Robert B. Guide to Illinois Library Resources, American Library Association, 1974.
3. Libraries & Information Centers in Chicago Metropolitan Area, Illinois Regional Library Council, 1973; rev. 1976.
4. Illinois Institute of Technology, Research Institute, Feasibility Study for A Bibliographic Bank in the Chicago Metropolitan Area, 1969-1970.

tive Collection Development Subcommittee by Harold Rath).

Concurrent with the program of identifying existing resource strengths in Illinois is the determination of unmet information needs. ILLINET should therefore undertake a continuous program of identifying weak subject areas and delegating responsibility for fulfilling these needs within each library system. Areas of specific subject responsibility for collection development should be assigned within each library system to handle unmet title and information needs reflected in unfilled requests. Conversely, requests filled at the library system, R & R Center, and Special Resource Center levels should be continually monitored to ascertain if appropriate levels of subject responsibilities are being maintained by local libraries. In addition, subject coordination among the Research and Reference Centers is essential to the support of the entire program.

In conjunction with the interlibrary loan request process, a survey of ILLINET libraries should be undertaken to ascertain what the local libraries consider to be their unmet subject needs. An insufficient variety of materials on popular subjects or lack of additional copies of particular titles should be considered by the libraries in an identification of unmet needs. Librarians should consider such unmet user needs as legitimate purchase options. The degree to which local libraries are meeting immediate heavy popular demand could be surveyed in relation to the actual titles being purchased by book buyers at large.

A statewide plan for cooperative storage and identification of infrequently used resource material should be considered in support of a full resources identification program. Success of such a facility will depend upon the positive attitudes of participating librarians for this material and its effective use. Any such storage facility should complement, in a network context, similar facilities already in existence.

REPORT OF THE ACCESS SUBCOMMITTEE

The primary purpose of the Illinois Library and Information Network is to provide the best possible access to the library resource of the state for its citizens. Because of the size and complexity of both the state and its resources, everything possible should be done to insure that channels of access within ILLINET function smoothly and efficiently. The complex flow of requests, materials, and information back and forth between library users and the various levels of ILLINET should not be hindered by a constant succession of unnecessary and time consuming delays. It is the purpose of this chapter to briefly examine current methods of access to ILLINET and to offer a few recommendations for improvement. For purposes of discussion we will look at two types of access: 1) bibliographic and 2) physical.

Bibliographic Access

By bibliographic access, we mean the various methods employed to locate and request materials or information from other members of ILLINET. We are not yet concerned with the transmission of materials or information back to the library user (physical access), but refer here only to the transmission of the library user's need to the appropriate level of the network. Today, many methods are employed in Illinois to route requests from ILLINET users to ILLINET members, including the teletype, the telephone, and written messages delivered by public or private mail.

Basically, ILLINET requests fall into two categories: requests for materials and requests for information. Usually these requests originate at a local unit of service, such as member public library or an affiliate academic, special, or school library. From these local units of service the requests are sent to one of the 18 library systems in Illinois. The systems, in turn, pass on the requests they cannot fill to ILLINET's four Research and Reference Centers.

At the present time, a variety of methods are employed by ILLINET members to request all types of materials and information.

Teletype is the most popular mode of access between systems and R & R Centers. It is much more rapid than mail and is superior to the telephone in that the teletyped message is accepted in lieu of a written request. It requires staff to send the messages and monitor the requests received. It is the one method of access which has a standardized format. The disadvantage of the teletype is that not all libraries have budgets that permit installation and staffing of this method.

Mail remains the most commonly used means for sending requests from individual libraries to systems. The advantages of this method are obvious. It is less costly and produces a valid, visible request for the accepting library. Where rapid receipt of requested material is desirable or necessary this method fails woefully. There is not one standardized method for transmitting requests although ALA forms are used by many libraries.

The telephone is used quite often between individual libraries and system libraries. It is the most popular procedure for information and materials requested between special libraries. It is a rapid, inexpensive method of requesting materials and information. In ILLINET, phone requests received by two R & R Centers, the University of Illinois and Chicago Public Library, must be validated by a written request before materials can be sent to the requestor.

Infopass (direct referral) involves a written card or form which is

assigned by an individual library or system library to be presented upon request for materials or information at a given library.

Recommendations

Although it is clear that there is already a fairly complex statewide system for the delivery of requests, we recommend the following actions:

1. That a committee or individual be charged with the preparation and publication of a manual, which would standardize formats for system access both to R & R Centers and to each other. Standardized methods of accessing, described in detail, should be included in the handbook. This manual would become the official procedural handbook for accessing books and information in ILLINET. Service to ILLINET members should be contingent on using the appropriate format outlined in the manual.
2. That to make the transition to a proposed unified format, we recommend that a vigorous education program be implemented. Necessary funds should be designed to finance workshops held at various locations in the state. Articles should appear in Illinois Libraries and other journals to reinforce the training received at the workshops. Brochures should be prepared for widespread distribution. Some formal discussion of the proposed manual of standardized format should be held at ILA and other librarians' organizational meetings.
3. That to prevent obsolescence of the proposed manual and maintain a relevant tool a unit drawn from both system and R & R level personnel be designated which is charged with on-going research exploring all possible ways and experimenting with new technology which can be applied to the problems of accessing the resources of ILLINET.
4. That, with the use of computerized data bases such as OCLC and CLSI becoming more common in Illinois, such bases should be tapped as means of access whenever possible. The present efforts to connect the CLSI data

banks of three northern library systems and the Illinois State Library for the purpose of interlibrary loan is an example of possible steps in this direction.

5. That the use of data base terminals directly by library patrons should be encouraged wherever possible. A recent survey of OCLC public use terminals shows that this is both feasible and beneficial.
6. That systems be encouraged to transmit requests to each other as well as to the R & R Centers. Lateral movement of requests within ILLINET should be encouraged by determining a method to provide increased funding for systems which provide materials to the rest of the state in the same way that the R & R Centers are compensated for such services.
7. That it should be possible, in the case of emergency rush requests, to transmit requests to any level of ILLINET by telephone.
8. That a study be made examining the possibility of a statewide direct referral (Infopass) system. The direct referral concept has already been applied successfully in several local areas. The proposed study could report both on the experiences of those areas where direct referral has been tried and suggest ways in which it might be used on a wider level.

Physical Access

By physical access, we mean the various methods employed to deliver materials and information within ILLINET. Here, we are concerned with how ILLINET, both in its individual parts and as a whole, responds once it has received a user's request. Just as there are several ways in which materials or information may be transmitted within ILLINET, there are also several ways in which materials or information may be transmitted through the network's different levels back to the user.

Among the delivery systems currently in use, we may distinguish between those which

are used to deliver materials and those which are used to deliver information. Unnecessary delay in the delivery of either type of response can lead to disgruntled, dissatisfied network users.

Materials delivery systems operate primarily from Research and Reference Centers to systems headquarters or members and from system headquarters to members and affiliates. There are at least three methods commonly used.

1. The first method is to transport the materials in a delivery vehicle owned by one of the components of ILLINET. This is probably the most common way of delivering materials from a system headquarters to a system library. The advantage of this method is that it is usually very dependable and minimizes the chance of loss or damage. There is a large initial cost for vehicle and driver, but this can be somewhat offset if the vehicle is used to deliver a large quantity of items which would represent a large cost if mailed.
2. The second method commonly used for the delivery of materials is the U.S. mail. The advantages of this method are that items can be sent almost anywhere and that it is still comparatively cheap, at least for libraries. Unfortunately there have recently been severe problems of loss, damage, and unduly long transit times with this method.
3. A third method that can be employed is shipment by a private delivery firm such as United Parcel Service. Although these firms are usually very dependable and often have a better performance than the U.S. mail, they may also be more expensive.

Information delivery systems are also a method of physical access. The delivery

of information often requires the delivery of materials as well. Therefore, all of the ways discussed previously for delivering materials can also be used for delivering information. There are also times, however, when information can be delivered by the use of other methods.

The telephone is probably the most common of these other alternatives. It offers the convenience of being an instrument usually owned by even the smallest of libraries (there are some exceptions even here) and it also allows the clearest and quickest interaction between the people on opposite ends. A drawback is that it can be fairly expensive if used over long distance for long periods of time. One method that may be employed to stimulate its use is the installation of a WATS line, trunk line, or similar device.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to determine the current state of ILLINET delivery systems and provide methods of improvement we recommend the following:

1. That a complete study be made of current delivery methods employed by each of the 18 library systems and four R & R Centers within ILLINET. The purpose of this study would be to provide an accurate picture of how materials and information are currently delivered to ILLINET users throughout the state.
2. That based on the results of the above study a master plan be developed for the establishment of a statewide delivery service which would minimize delivery times between any two points in the ILLINET system. Such a state delivery system could of course incorporate, where advantageous, existing local delivery arrangements.
3. That provision be made for the adequate funding and staffing

of both the initial study and planning and the eventual implementation of a state delivery system.

4. That any unnecessary existing obstacles to the transmission of information back to ILLINET users and members by telephone be removed.
5. That funding and establishment of a statewide delivery system be accompanied by the creation of a permanent position at the state level whose responsibilities would include overseeing the ILLINET delivery system. The responsibilities of the position should also include searching for ways in which new technologies can be used to improve the delivery time of the network.
6. Finally, that standards be established for maximum turnaround times of requests at various points of the ILLINET delivery process.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Cooperative collection development has been most simply defined by the Subcommittee as a program among a fixed group of libraries to acquire all materials within a defined scope and to eliminate unnecessary duplication through agreement to share those materials. This definition presumes that three major factors are present. First, each library must have the ability to identify the holdings of all the libraries within the fixed group. Secondly, all identifiable materials are available for use to all cooperating libraries through interlibrary loan, photocopy or facsimile transmission, and/or on-site access. Thirdly, requests for materials not currently owned in cooperating libraries can be directed to libraries accepting the responsibility for collecting in that subject area.

Since few of the above prerequisites exist in ILLINET, and those that do, exist only

within the present hierarchical structure, it is not possible to develop a full cooperative collection development program at this time.

To develop a true cooperative collection development program, several prefatory steps must be taken to meet the current library demands of the greatest number of people in the state. This report is meant to be a catalyst. If its recommendations and priorities are properly addressed and implemented, not only will it be possible to develop a cooperative collection development program, but ILLINET will continue to develop as one of the most progressive library networks in the country.

Resource development is not handled in any standardized philosophical way among types of libraries in Illinois. Although many libraries have written collection development policies, they were written with "material orientation" rather than "user orientation" as a basis. The Subcommittee determined from the beginning of its deliberations that the only valid method of meeting library needs of citizens is the adoption of "user orientation" as the basis for acquisitions at the local level - a local library being defined as any library - academic, public, school, or special - in its function of serving its primary clientele.

For years librarians have been talking about the services they provide and about how well they anticipate the needs of users in their collection development practices. The subcommittee contends that this is, in reality, not always the case and that librarians should begin to listen to the demands of their users and set up mechanisms to meet those demands. The subcommittee further contends that this change in basic philosophy will result in high use collections geared to primary clientele, thus easing the establishment of a cooperative collection development program to meet the needs of those seeking less frequently used materials.

If ILLINET is to continue to grow, it must develop the above philosophy for local

library levels and dedicate its resources and energies toward access to those less frequently used materials for all users. These two concepts, "user oriented collection development" and "access", are the two keys upon which this report is based. They must become ILLINET's basic concepts so that this developmental program can become a complete cooperative collection development program for the network.

1. *The first recommendation of the Subcommittee is that ALL PARTICIPATING LIBRARIES IN ILLINET ADOPT AND FOSTER "USER ORIENTED ACQUISITIONS" AS THEIR COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT PHILOSOPHY.*

   Each ILLINET participant must assume responsibility for meeting the general needs of its primary clientele. At the local library level, traditional "selective" resource development will be changed to user-oriented development of resources. Resource development at the local level must be designed to respond to what the users need to meet their recurring educational, recreational, and intellectual needs.

   It does not mean that anything requested by a user will automatically be acquired. It does mean that when requests are made for materials at the local level, the local library will make a judgement as to whether this is something that can and should be added. Standards of quality or literary merit should not be imposed. The simple fact that the user desires the material should be sufficient for the material to be considered for purchase.

2. *The second recommendation is that PARTICIPANTS IN ILLINET WORK TOWARD ACCESS TO MATERIALS IN ALL COLLECTIONS OF PARTICIPATING LIBRARIES FOR ALL USERS.*

It should be the responsibility of systems to coordinate the development of collections within the system that reflect the demand of their local libraries. ILLINET should designate responsibility and accountability for the coordination of the development of collections within the system area as the responsibility of the system strata of the network. Funds provided to systems for collection building should be used for supplemental resources accessible to all participating libraries.

Beyond these special resources, each system should assume collection development responsibility for an in depth subject collection of a non-research nature in an appropriate subject area. In determining which systems will collect in what areas, the existing studies of Illinois library strengths should initially be examined to avoid unnecessary duplication of specialized subject collections.

Research and Reference Center directors, along with library system directors, are urged to accept levels of collection development responsibility as defined in this report and also to accept the responsibility of encouraging participating libraries to comply with those levels.

3. *The third recommendation is that THE STATE LIBRARY SPONSOR A STATEWIDE IN DEPTH SURVEY TO DETERMINE UNMET NEEDS, EXAMINE SUBJECT STRENGTHS AND FROM THESE EXAMINATIONS, SPECIFY SYSTEM SUBJECT COLLECTION RESPONSIBILITIES.*

The Subcommittee on Responsibilities at All Levels has made an attempt to specify some collection development responsibility by broad areas for the Research and Reference Centers. The suggestions are broad and by no means cover all areas of knowledge.

What has been done indicates, however, that until mechanisms are set up to monitor collection strengths and user needs, some libraries can logically be designated to collect certain types of materials for use throughout ILLINET.

When areas of responsibility for subject collection development are accepted by systems, cooperating libraries within systems, Research and Reference Centers, or Special Resource Centers, it will be the function of those systems and libraries to maintain as complete collections as possible for ready access by all ILLINET libraries.

4. *Prior to and in conjunction with these activities, the Subcommittee recommends that ILLINET EMBARK ON AN IMMEDIATE PROGRAM TO EDUCATE THE PUBLIC TO ITS CURRENT AND FUTURE ROLE IN LIBRARY SERVICE TO THEIR COMMUNITY. SIMULTANEOUSLY, ILLINET SHOULD INSTITUTE A PROGRAM FOR EDUCATING LIBRARIANS, LIBRARY STAFFS, MEMBERS OF BOARDS OF GOVERNANCE, AND LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS FOR OPTIMUM UTILIZATION OF THE NETWORK AS AN INTERGRAL PART OF THEIR LIBRARY SERVICE.*

As collections build and as the existing research collections within the state continue to grow the facilities to handle the service them will become physically inadequate. Overflow and little used materials must be accommodated.

5. *The fifth recommendation of the Subcommittee is that ILLINET STUDY THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A STRATEGICALLY LOCATED STORAGE CENTER (OR CENTERS) FOR LITTLE USED OR LAST COPY MATERIALS.*

The number and nature of such centers will need considerable study. The subcommittee submits that it is no longer logical

or economically sensible in a given area(s) to continue to hold and store duplicates of little used materials. The establishment of a center similar to the Center for Research Libraries, or the British Library Lending Division, perhaps at a less than research oriented level, should be seriously considered in Illinois.

To ease utilization of such facilities, it is imperative that all libraries in ILLINET have bibliographic access to the collections of all participating libraries. Without this bibliographic access any attempts at coordination or resource sharing would be farcical. Automated bibliographic access to collections outside of ILLINET has already been initiated by the installation of OCLC processing at Research and Reference Centers and special and academic libraries. Ultimately all bibliographic access will be automated and the subcommittee contends that Illinois, already a leader in the field, ought to be the first completely automated statewide network.

6. *The sixth recommendation of the Subcommittee is that ILLINET SHOULD MOVE TOWARD CONVERSION TO MACHINE READABLE FORM OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHIC HOLDINGS RECORDS OF COOPERATING LIBRARIES. THIS STATEWIDE DATA BASE SHOULD BE CREATED TO BE COMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING BASES SUCH AS OCLC; BALLOTS; AND OTHER STATE, REGIONAL AND NATIONAL RESOURCE IDENTIFICATION PROGRAMS.*

The above recommendation concurs with that of the Illinois State Library's Automation Committee.

When bibliographic and holdings information is available to all cooperating ILLINET libraries the need will then exist for information on availability of the identified materials. The quickest way to determine this availability would be to establish a statewide computer based universal circulation system. At present the subcommittee

sees this as a financial and political impossibility largely because of the independence of institutions and the expense already involved in the current automated circulation systems. The subcommittee does believe, however, that availability of information and physical access can be improved by changing the access structure of ILLINET.

7. *The seventh recommendation of the Subcommittee is that the PRESENT LARGELY HIERARCHICAL INTERLIBRARY LOAN AND INFORMATION REQUEST STRUCTURE BE CHANGED TO ENCOURAGE LATERAL AS WELL AS VERTICAL REQUESTING PROCEDURES.*

   Lateral access will be especially helpful when it is known that a nearby library holds the needed materials or information. The ability to go directly to the cooperating library rather than through a Research and Reference Center or library system will aid libraries in getting requests filled rapidly for their users. The natural problem evolving from all resource identification programs if physical access both on site and remote.

8. *The eighth recommendation of the Subcommittee is that a COMPLETE STUDY BE MADE OF THE CURRENT DELIVERY METHODS EMPLOYED BY EACH OF THE SYSTEMS WITHIN ILLINET AND THAT, FROM SUCH A STUDY, A PLAN BE DEVISED FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A STATEWIDE DELIVERY SERVICE THAT WILL MINIMIZE DELIVERY TIMES BETWEEN ANY TWO POINTS IN ILLINET.*

Beyond a rapid delivery service, which should include automated delivery of information as well as delivery of materials, there is a very real need for on site access to materials by users willing to travel to libraries other than those they customarily use.

9. *The ninth recommendation of the Subcommittee is that ILLINET WORK TOWARD THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNIVERSAL ACCESS CARD TO ALL PARTICIPATING LIBRARIES. THIS CARD SHOULD ALLOW ANY HOLDER TO BORROW MATERIALS AVAILABLE FOR LENDING AND TO USE, ON SITE, ANY MATERIALS NOT AVAILABLE FOR LENDING.*

The Subcommittee believes that the current designation of several libraries as Research and Reference Centers is misleading. The roles of these centers were not clearly detailed in the original legislation creating them. Their greatest role, to date, has been supplying interlibrary loan materials and answering information requests through ILLINET.

10. *The tenth recommendation of the Subcommittee is that THE NAME RESEARCH AND REFERENCE CENTER BE CHANGED TO RESOURCE AND RESEARCH CENTER TO MORE ACCURATELY DESCRIBE THE FUNCTION OF THE CENTERS.*

While examining the possibilities of establishing a cooperative collection development program for the state, the subcommittee discovered that there already exists an abundance of material in the form of guides to collections throughout the state and, within some library systems, automated circulation control systems which afford holdings information, interlibrary loan records, union holdings lists by subject, etc. The subcommittee also discovered that there is no one charged with the responsibility for coordinating this available information to make it useful throughout the state. The task would be a formidable one but not one that could be attempted by the subcommittee, comprised as it is, of working librarians whose primary responsibility is to their place of employment.

11. *The eleventh, and final, recommendation of the Subcommittee is that THE RESEARCH AND REFERENCE CENTER DIRECTORS ESTABLISH AND FUND A COOPERATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE EMPLOYING A FULL TIME DIRECTOR AND SUP-*

PORT STAFF.

This task force should be charged with implementing the recommendations of this report and coordinating the bibliographic access program in conjunction with those in the state charged with library automation responsibilities.

RESEARCH AND REFERENCE CENTER DIRECTORS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COOPERATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

GOAL:

To identify the unmet needs of citizens who use the Illinois Library and Information Network* for resources and information

OBJECTIVES:

1. To determine the needs of users not currently being met through ILLINET
2. To review available studies and reports on collection development and interlibrary loan within ILLINET
   - to determine if additional studies are necessary
3. To identify subject areas most frequently not being filled within ILLINET
4. To suggest possible areas of cooperation and coordination among the components of ILLINET in collection development to meet needs of citizens who utilize ILLINET
5. To suggest possible methods of implementation of cooperative collection development by subject areas
6. To suggest pilot or experimental projects to test methods of cooperative collection development suggested by the Subcommittee
7. To study, along with the Research and Reference Center Directors, the role of Research and Reference Centers in the area of collection development

* Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET)

ILLINET is the Illinois library systems with their member public libraries and affiliate academic, special and school libraries, the Research and Reference Centers and the Special Resource Centers. These systems and libraries, coordinated by the Illinois State Library, voluntarily agree to work together to provide improved and additional services and resources, not available to Illinois residents without such cooperation among the individual institutions.

LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION CENTERS IN THE CHICAGO METROPOLITAN AREA

COST ESTIMATES

Here is a description of the 1976 revision of LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION CENTERS IN THE CHICAGO METROPOLITAN AREA published by the Illinois Regional Library Council. Cost data is presented as an indicator to what it might cost to produce a statewide directory. All data on the approximately 400 institutions represented is in machine-readable form to make future up-dates faster and less expensive.

LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION CENTERS IN THE CHICAGO METROPOLITAN AREA

(ILLINOIS REGIONAL LIBRARY COUNCIL)

The Council's directory documents information resources in the area and conditions under which they are accessible. Over 380 individual entries are listed for libraries and information centers, each including historical background and objectives statements, open hours, holdings, special collections, subject strengths, library publications, borrowing privileges and privileges extended to infopass holders, copying facilities, and staff listings. A section on information on professional associations is included. An extensive index provides a guide to subject strengths and special collections of the libraries listed. Fall 1976. 600 pages, hardbound. LC 76-8351. ISBN 0-917060-01-6. Members: $9.25; non-members: $15.00/copy.

The evolution of LICCMA:

Date	Title	Pages	Entries	Indexes, Appendixes, etc.
Dec. 1972	INFOPASS Directory	323	135 (Council members only)	Subject Index Geographical Index Council Information Section Professional Associations Section Librarians Index (issued separately)

The evolution of LICCMA: (cont.)

Date	Title	Pages	Entries	Indexes, Appendixes, etc.
Sept. 1973	Libraries and Information Centers in the Chicago Metropolitan Area	499	303 (Council members and some non-members)	Subject Index (expanded) Geog. Index Prof. Assoc. section, incl. Council Information
Oct. 1976	LICCMA-2	600	387	Subject Index (expanded) Geographical Index Professional Associations Council Information Section Infopass Information Section Librarians Index

Estimated cost of production of 1000 copies of LICCMA-2

Compiling	Member libraries and Joel Lee: volunteer effort (7 months)
Editing	Joel Lee, Hillis Griffin, Don Culbertson - volunteer effort (4 months)
Programming	Hillis Griffin, Don Culbertson - volunteer effort - (1 month)
Keyboarding	Hillis Griffin (volunteering) and Argonne staff ($742.50) (3 months)
Shared computer	Time on Bowne Time Sharing for Argonne keyboarding ($843.45)
Phototypesetting	Computype, Boston - bid at $2,900.00 (4 months)
Printing/Binding	R.R. Donnelley - bid $6,200.00 (6 weeks including distribution)
Total cost	$10,686.00 (estimate) or $10.67/volume
Price	To Council members: $9.25; to non-members: $15.00

NOMINAL GROUP TECHNIQUE

At the initial meeting of the Subcommittee a modification of the nominal group technique was used in order to get all members of the Subcommittee participating on an equal basis. Each person was given 5 3X5 cards upon which to write what that person considered the top priorities in addressing the subcommittee's charge "To identify the current needs of citizens who use the Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET) for resources and information" and suggest ways to meet those needs.

Each person wrote one priority per card. In round robin fashion each person read on priority at a time which was then transferred to a large sheet of paper. As each sheet was filled with priorities it was taped to the wall. By the end of this portion of the exercise approximately one hundred priorities had been enumerated. Examining the priorities hanging about the meeting room, nine broad areas of classification were determined. These were:

1. DEFINITION OF TERMS
2. RESOURCED IDENTIFICATION
3. RESPONSIBILITY AT ALL LEVELS
4. REALISTIC PARAMETERS
5. PLANNING/IMPLEMENTATION
6. ACCESS
7. BUDGETS/FUNDING
8. LEGAL RAMIFICATIONS
9. EVALUATION

Each priority was then classed under one of the above. Many of the items could be included in more than one category.

At its next meeting the subcommittee reexamined the statements and began eliminating duplication and setting priorities within the nine groups listed above.

The results were as follows:

DEFINITION OF TERMS

TOTAL POINTS

80	What does CCD mean?
79	What are the limitations to CCD such as, financial, geographic?
79	Do R & R Centers need a new definition in 1976?
76	What does the term "resources" mean?

RESOURCES IDENTIFICATION

82	What strong resources now exist in ILLINET and where are they?
75	What are current resources?
74	In what areas are we repeatedly unable to fill requests for information?
73	Why are needs not met? Material not in network? Material in network but inaccessible?
64	What do we currently have in Illinois?
64	What are unmet needs as well as strengths?
64	Can we do anything spectacular about CCD without bibliographic access to collections?
63	In CCD are we seeing it from the view of the librarian or the needs of the user?
63	What about government documents-federal, state, local, U.N. and international and how do we gain speedy access to these materials?
63	What are the ramifications of OCLC, CLSI and others on CCD?
62	What is the impact of OCLC on acquisitions, duplication and CCD?
61	Should we consider resources regardless of format?
61	Who will collect "junk" and esoteric materials?
60	Are there areas in which we do not need to collect?
56	Are we weak only in specific subject areas?
54	How do we identify little used resources?
54	What about cooperative weeding and last copies?
50	What is the impact of ILLINET written acquisition policies?
45	What are policies for nonprint materials?

RESPONSIBILITY AT ALL LEVELS

84	Are R & R Centers meeting their responsibilities? Should they be funded more? Should they be reorganized?
82	How does interlibrary loan relate to CCD?
82	What are appropriate levels of responsibility for local libraries, Systems and R & R Centers?
79	What should Systems perception of their role be?
76	Policy statements should include well-defined levels of development.
73	Who will develop State wide serial holdings?
73	What about the support of the reference function of the R & R Centers?
71	What is the scope of ILLINET? Are any of the needs of network members outside the scope of ILLINET? How much impact will this have on R & R Center's acquisition policies?
71	What about circulation policies and access?
66	What about looking at regional CCD?
58	What is the impact of ILLINET written acquisition policies?
56	How do you know the acquisition policies of others?
56	How should we avoid duplication of little used resources?
54	What about cooperative weeding and last copies?
45	What is the effect of school libraries on ILLINET?
39	Can we really totally exhaust local resources before referral?
38	How do we identify unique needs of certain institutions?

REALISTIC PARAMETERS

81	Is a state collection data base practical?
59	Can we fill everything?
59	Are there areas in which we do not need to collect?
45	How do we determine appropriateness of requests? Reference questions? How much service can be asked for?
41	Can we really totally exhaust local resources before referral?

PLANNING/IMPLEMENTATION

76	How can we best communicate to others about what we do have in our libraries?

74	What are possible methods of CCD?
74	How does interlibrary loan relate to CCD?
71	Is there an ultimate need for a long range plan for all types of libraries?
68	What about looking at regional CCD?
67	What about the impact of OCLC and Middlnet?
65	OCLC lists of current orders avoids duplication. Whis is OCLC's impact on acquisitions and cooperation?
58	How can academic libraries other than R & R Centers be more involved in CCD?
54	How can non-state supported institutions be encouraged to coordinate collection development?
54	What are the ramifications of OCLC, CLSI and others of CCD?
51	Is there a need for more Special Resource Centers?
48	How do we serve the unserved?
48	How do we deal with getting enough popular material for everybody?
48	What about the use of OCLC clusters for terminals?
41	What about CCD between institutions with no administrative similarity?
33	Would CCD raise the possibility of centralized purchasing/processing?
ACCESS	
85	How will we have quick access to collected materials?
84	How can we currently access what we have?
61	What about government documents-federal, state, local, U.N. and international and how do we gain speedy access to these materials?
57	How are programs of private cooperatives being tapped?
46	How do we have access to current statistical materials?
46	How do we access and use A/V material?
45	What about the use of OCLC clusters for terminals?
14	Do we need a Statewide Information Center?
BUDGETS/FUNDING	
73	Where does the money come from to implement Subcommittee recommendations?

73	Should libraries accepting CCD responsibilities be funded additionally?
62	Is it appropriate to use State/Federal funds to support CCD?
62	What are the effects of budgets cuts on CCD?
57	What is the impact of CCD on individual institution's budgets?
53	CCD personnel needs communication between book selecting personnel. Will institutional staff have an understanding of network holdings?

LEGAL RAMIFICATIONS

83	What is the possible impact of coypright legislation?
83	What are the legal ramifications/limitations on CCD?
54	What are the legal ramifications about gifts and exchange of state and local property?
23	What ramifications will CCD have to publishers?

EVALUATION

84	If CCD agreements are reached should they be monitored?
81	How is interlibrary loan monitored today?

APPENDIX D

ILLINOIS STATE LIBRARY TASK FORCE ON NON-PRINT MATERIALS

Bridget L. Lamont
David O. Cooperider
Dennis Huslig
Sylvia Twerdahl
Don Winsor

Leon L. Drolet, Jr., Chairperson
Grace Grzanek
Charles W. Hayes
George H. Voegel

Report of the Illinois State Library Task Force on Access to Non-Print Materials September, 1976

The Illinois State Library Task Force on Access to Non-Print Materials limited its attention to those materials which are not currently being made available through the inter-library loan network of the State of Illinois. Therefore, excluded from consideration were books, serials, periodicals and monographs, as they appear in print or in microform.

The major goal of the Task Force was to improve access to non-print materials throughout the State of Illinois. From the onset, the Task Force realized that, due to the enormity of the scope of the project, it would be impossible to provide a concrete program which would allow the citizens to secure materials regardless of location or format. Therefore, the Task Force considered the difficulties of access on a philosophical basis and arrived at several recommendations.

The Task Force approached the problem of access from the viewpoint that there were two types of activities which were available to a person seeking information. The options open to the person were either to search for the desired materials among the local resource centers or to query a regional center which would provide an overview of a broad base of localities. The term "horizontal" was given the the activity of searching for materials on a local level while the term "vertical" referred to the activity required when local resources failed to provide the desired material and therefore, as a recourse, a regional search would be required. If the regional center failed to locate the material a further vertical movement would be required. The vertical movement would continue until the desired materials were secured or until alternate or possible sources were eliminated. The horizontal movement would be more limited in scope in that the number of resources in a given area would be limited.

The resource centers defined as local include public libraries, educational service regions, townships, film cooperatives, special libraries serving business and industry, and local governmental agencies. Those resource centers listed as regional include library systems, state agencies, professional groups, and regional cooperatives.

The movement between the resource centers whether on a horizontal or vertical plan could be impeded by a number of obstacles. A common barrier to both movements is the format in which the material was produced. Unless the end user has the playback capability to use the item(s) supplied or made available, access to the information desired is impossible.

The Task Force, in order to gain a proper perspective of the obstacles to access, identified three additional types of barriers which are associated with each activity. One group of barriers centers around the accessibility of the resource centers. For horizontal movements, they are barriers such as geographical location, local policies on circulation to non-members, the circulation mechanisms used to provide the material, bibliographic control, the identification of the resource center as actually having the material required. On a vertical basis, due to a greater distance between centers and the number of agencies involved, communication problems arise between the points of access. Some of the areas of difficulty are bibliographic access, referral, procedural limitations, and delivery.

In addition to those obstacles which impede the task of locating and securing needed materials, a second group of barriers involves legal restrictions. Requirements imposed by copy right law are common to both the horizontal and vertical access movement. Local retrieval of information is further hindered by the legal question posed by separate taxing bodies such as the relationship of a school district to a public library district; materials purchased with earmarked funds which limit the use to the purchasing agency; contracts with producers which establish parameters of use; and non-member utilization.

On a regional or vertical basis, federal as well as state laws inhibit the transfer of materials from one agency to another. Due to the concern for local autonomy, the willingness of agencies to cooperate on a regional basis may be restrained. As experienced on a local basis, the same limitations are imposed by producers, earmarked funds, and agency regulations.

The third category of obstacles to access to non-print materials is linked to budget and/or funding authorization. The need for monies is similar for local as well as regional operation. Providing an archival service in cotrast to providing current high demand items requires different funding activities and the effectiveness of using these funds has a direct correlation to the ability of the agency to supply needed material.

The Task Force realized that the levels of responsibility as well as the barriers to access to non-print materials were very similar to those which had been identified for printed materials. The only unique characteristic between print and non-print was the difficulty imposed by a multitude of formats. As a result, the Task Force equated its position to the situation faced by the State Library when it originally dealt with the problem of providing access to printed materials.

The Task Force on Access to Non-Print Materials was stymied by the absence of the information which would be required prior to the assembly of a proposal for a network geared to handle non-book demands. Without knowledge of the extent of the resources and the exact nature of the barriers, the State Library, regardless of subsequent task force recommendations, will be unable to act effectively and efficiently. Based on this premise, the Task Force recommends the following activities be accomplished by the State Library:

I. Continue the coordinating role for intra-agency concern with access to non-print materials in order to effect increased cooperation and coordination.

   The Illinois State Library should evaluate its present committees and, where warranted, add members who have non-print expertise.

II. Hire a full-time consultant.

The Illinois State Library has already taken a unique step in forming a task force on non-print access and should continue its leadership. There is a need for a consultant to develop the ideas presented by the task and to coordinate the many State Library activities which directly or indirectly involve access to non-print materials.

Among the responsibilities of this consultant would be:

A. Encouraging cooperative collection development, thus enabling a more effective and economical approach to building State Library material resources.

B. Promoting the use of non-print materials as an essential part of the Illinois State Library's Information Network.

C. Constructing through field research an accurate overview of the State's non-print resources and suggesting activities which would encourage statewide access.

D. Overseeing an in-depth survey of non-print material resources.

III. Make an in-depth survey of non-print material resources.

The Illinois State Library should assume responsibility for an in-depth survey which would identify the non-print resources and the general problems inhibiting access to them. The Illinois State Library may seek outside assistance from other state agencies such as the Illinois Office of Education.

IV. Develop an inter-library loan policy to be inclusive of non-print materials.

V. Lead in establishing standard definitions and codes for non-print materials for management information systems.

VI. Assume the role of coordinating interstate cooperative arrangements for non-print materials.

The Task Force recommends the following activities be performed by Library Systems:

I. Develop and implement a plan for non-print cooperation at the inter-system & intra-system level working with local and regional agencies.

II. Search for new resources for non-print materials with the region and report these to the Illinois State Library.

III. Encourage the development of a coordinated acquisition program for non-print materials within the system.

The Task Force recommends the following activities be performed by local agencies (academic, school, special, public):

I. Allow for the inter-library loan of their non-print materials to those authorized agencies.

II. Permit the in-house use by outside users of materials which may not circulate.

III. Encourage the reciprocal borrowing of non-print materials between agencies.